



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,729	09/30/2004	Timothy Ernest Simmons	2006579-0255 (CTX-124)	5728
69665	7590	03/03/2009	EXAMINER	
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC.			CERVETTI, DAVID GARCIA	
TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOSTON, MA 02110			2436	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/03/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/711,729	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SIMMONS, TIMOTHY ERNEST
	<b>Examiner</b> David Garcia Cervetti	<b>Art Unit</b> 2436

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/06/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/8/08

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant's arguments filed December 15 and September 8, 2008, have been fully considered.
2. Claims 1-14 are pending and have been examined.

***Response to Amendment***

3. The objection to the specification is withdrawn.
4. The requirement for information is withdrawn in view of the response.
5. The rejection under 35 USC 101 is withdrawn.
6. Applicant's arguments with respect to the prior art have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasmazel et al. (US 6,032,260, hereinafter Sasmazel), and further in view of Putman et al. (US 2008/0086564, hereinafter Putman).**

**Regarding claims 1 and 6,** Sasmazel teaches receiving, by a ticketing authority server, a ticket generation request and information about a client node (col. 7, lines 1-20);

identifying, by the ticketing authority server, a master session ticket associated in a storage element with the client node (col. 8, lines 25-60);

generating, by a ticketing authority server, a derivative session ticket for the client node (col. 8, lines 25-60, fig. 8C); and

storing, by a ticketing authority server, information about the client node and the derivative session ticket in the storage element (col. 8, lines 25-60).

Sasmazel teaches updating the ticket (col. 8, lines 25-60, which maps to generating a derivative ticket, the language is “an updated eticket is created”, arguably Sasmazel chooses to update vs. creating a new, but could be easily modified to add another record for the updated eticket, that way auditing of the tickets created could be facilitated). Further, Putman teaches associating, by a ticketing authority server (session manager), the derivative session ticket with the master session ticket (token hierarchy) (par.174-177). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a hierarchy as taught by Putman. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to track tickets issued to client nodes (Putman, par.174-177).

**Regarding claim 13, Sasmazel teaches**

receiving, by a ticket authority server, a session ticket renewal request and a session ticket (col. 7, lines 1-20);

retrieving, by a ticket authority server, the session associated with the received session ticket; renewing, by a ticket authority server, session expiration date; retrieving,

by a ticket authority server, the master session ticket associated with the received session ticket (col. 8, lines 25-60, fig. 8C);

renewing, by a ticket authority server, the session expiration date of the master session ticket (col. 7, lines 40-67);

retrieving, by a ticket authority server, any derivative ticket associated with the master session ticket (col. 8, lines 25-60); and

renewing, by a ticket authority server, the session expiration date of the derivative session ticket associated with the master session ticket (col. 8, lines 25-45).

Sasmazel teaches updating the ticket (col. 8, lines 25-60, which maps to generating a derivative ticket, the language is "an updated eticket is created", arguably Sasmazel chooses to update vs. creating a new, but could be easily modified to add another record for the updated eticket, that way auditing of the tickets created could be facilitated). Further, Putman teaches associating, by a ticketing authority server (session manager), the derivative session ticket with the master session ticket (token hierarchy) (par.174-177). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a hierarchy as taught by Putman. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to track tickets issued to client nodes (Putman, par.174-177).

**Regarding claim 2**, the combination of Sasmazel and Putman teaches wherein step (b) further comprises identifying a master session ticket for the client node by using the received information to query the storage element (col. 8, lines 25-60, fig. 8C).

**Regarding claim 3**, the combination of Sasmazel and Putman teaches wherein step (c) comprises generating a master session ticket for the client node (col. 7, lines 1-20).

**Regarding claim 4**, the combination of Sasmazel and Putman teaches wherein step (c) further comprises assigning a session profile type to the derivative session ticket, the session profile type configured via a policy engine (col. 7, lines 20-50, fig. 8C).

**Regarding claim 5**, the combination of Sasmazel and Putman teaches wherein step (d) further comprises associating, by the ticketing authority server, the derivative session ticket and the master session ticket by storing a reference to the derivative session ticket in the storage element entry for the master session ticket (col. 8, lines 25-60, fig. 8C).

**Regarding claim 7**, the combination of Sasmazel and Putman teaches wherein the master session ticket further comprises a client identifier (col. 7, lines 20-50).

**Regarding claim 8**, the combination of Sasmazel and Putman teaches wherein the client identifier comprises a user name (col. 7, lines 1-15).

**Regarding claim 9**, the combination of Sasmazel and Putman teaches wherein the client identifier comprises a domain name (col. 7, lines 1-15).

**Regarding claim 10**, the combination of Sasmazel and Putman teaches wherein the master session ticket further comprises a session profile type, the session profile type configured via a policy engine (col. 7, lines 20-50).

**Regarding claim 11**, the combination of Sasmazel and Putman teaches wherein the derivative session ticket further comprises a session profile type, the session profile type configured via a policy engine (col. 7, lines 20-50).

**Regarding claim 12**, the combination of Sasmazel and Putman teaches wherein the derivative session ticket further comprises a reference to the master session ticket (fig. 8C).

**Regarding claim 14**, the combination of Sasmazel and Putman teaches wherein step (b) further comprises querying a storage element to retrieve the session information associated with the session ticket (col. 8, lines 25-60).

***Conclusion***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David García Cervetti whose telephone number is (571)272-5861. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday and Thursday-Friday.

10. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on (571)272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David García Cervetti/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2436